

**Workshop on Successful Collaboration and Transfer of ORD Products to the
EPA Regions**
EPA – Cinc
October 19, 2006

MORNING SESSION

Opening Remarks

- 1) Dick Garnas (ORD/OSP)
 - a) Works with Regional Science Liaisons (RSLs) and Hazardous Substance Technical Liaisons (HSTLs) to promote collaboration between ORD and regions to move ORD products out where needed.
 - b) Goal for meeting is to share experiences related to collaboration and the transfer of products. Will have panel of scientists talking about their experiences.
 - c) Will look back at RTP workshop (Pat Burke) – also was an opportunity to increase collaboration with regional partners
 - d) Note that we won't be showcasing ORD products, but focusing on how we develop those products in conjunction with regions and how to get them out to the regions. Want to create a lot of work for RSLs and HSTLs by calling them and making connections!
- 2) Pat Burke (ORD/NRMRL) – on RTP workshop in November 2005 (see Powerpoint)
 - a) Was packed house – all about how to collaborate better.
 - b) ORD presenters – had gleam in their eye about their research and how the region collaboration paid off.
 - c) Regional reps also talked about immediate needs – e.g., Katrina.
 - d) Important take-home messages:
 - i) going to EIMS or databases or searching publications wasn't going to get them the answer when they needed it. They use the phone to find the right people.
 - ii) Really important to market research so it's useful at the right time. NRMRL will have communications officers.
 - iii) When you have a great product, they'd like you to demonstrate its power. Try to plan it into your communication strategy so it includes travel.
 - iv) Get regions involved in rolling it out.
 - v) Note that OSP hosts product expos – very popular with regional staff, state and local users
 - vi) Involve key customers along the way – they will ground truth the research so it can be used right away
 - vii) Also need to improve outreach to academia
 - e) Since RTP
 - i) ORMA Science Connector coming soon – a self-managed project web page.
 - ii) EIMS lives and is growing – lots of searching capability
 - iii) Internet pages are moving toward linked topics
 - iv) However, there's more competition for less funding, so need to build case for funding your project
 - v) Consider other communication options: Podcasts, RSS feeds, multimedia
 - vi) Showed picture of old Technical Assistance Directory – was outdated the minute it was published. Now use Biosketch – is on intranet. Need to keep current (manage your data!) - can enter own data to a point. Publications get put in automatically.

Presentations (see Powerpoints)

Florence Fulk (Acting Director, ORD/NERL/EERD) – Regional PARTnerships

- 1) Why regional partnerships?
 - a) MRI and RARE pays for it. Others just enjoy doing it.
- 2) External driver – is PART (Program Assessment Rating Tool). How are we doing, what are challenges
 - a) lots of assessment tools in past to show we're doing what we said we would. Johnson – had Planning, Program and Budget System. Nixon – Mgmt by Objective. Clinton – GPRA (Government Performance and Results Act)!
 - b) Current administration said GPRA is not quite meeting the mark.
 - c) Developed PART to strengthen and reinforce GPRA, but also a quantitative, standardized assessment to improve performance leading to better results.
 - d) Identify program strengths and weaknesses. Also informs program management decisions – i.e., if program is not performing, may lose funds...or get more
 - e) Consists of a questionnaire completed by the program being assessed – opportunity to state your case
 - f) Review 20% of all programs each year, so will be 5-yr rotation.
 - g) Composed of 4 areas – score of 0-100 for each, then are weighted and combined. “Effective” is best, then “moderately effective,” “adequate,” “ineffective,” and “results not demonstrated.”
 - i) Program Purpose and Design – 20% of total score. Clarity and relevance of purpose and soundness of design.
 - ii) Strategic planning – only 10% - priority setting, long term goals and APMs. Want ambitious targets leading to improvement and independent evaluations (hence the flurry of BOSC reviews)
 - iii) Program mgmt - 20% - is program effectively managed to meet goals – involves efficiency measures with baselines and target
 - iv) Program Results and Accountability – is 50%! Evaluating progress to achieve targets for APGs and LTGs and efficiency measures.
 - h) Many PART assessments completed – see graph. Many in red – “results not demonstrated,” meaning you can't show that it's effective (it may or may not actually be effective).
 - i) 43 programs assessed for EPA – we're below average on “results not demonstrated,” above average on “adequate.” None received “effective.”
 - i) Scores inform funding – funding was cut in one program
 - ii) ORD PART in 2003 and 2004. Many with results not demonstrated. 2 were re-PARTed in 2005 (allowed to ask for reassessment). Eco still seen as ineffective. Human Health and Drinking Water are “adequate”
 - iii) 7 programs moderately effective – did well in purpose, planning, and mgmt. Results varied a lot
 - iv) 8 programs seen as ineffective or results not demonstrated.
 - j) Comments from assessment – effective programs were able to be very specific about their impact – e.g., estimated lives saved. So, need baselines and targets.
 - i) Must increase scores. Need to demonstrate linkage between ORD research and achievement of outcomes, which we do through linkage with regional and state level.
 - ii) While we support national decisions, the front line is at the regional office.
 - iii) Need partnerships - Demonstrate contribution of ORD research to past regional decision-making, improve delivery of ORD science and expertise to inform regional decisions, promote partnerships that achieve designed environmental outcomes thru MYP process.

- k) OSP has initiative to push collaboration – identify examples of how ORD research has led to concrete outcomes and to expand regional collaboration
 - i) One example – Region 3 EMAP landscapes combined with Regional Vulnerability Assessment (ReVA) – NERL scientists developed landscape ecology models and indicators. Enabled Maryland to identify most vulnerable areas and acquire them with grants to turn into conservation areas. Great outcome.
- 3) So, why partnerships? Is an external reason, but ultimately it is because it's what we do – our mission is to protect and restore the environment we're responsible for for future generations.
- 4) Q&A
 - a) Q: Based on past accountability programs, it seems to take agencies a while to understand how to word responses. Are we getting better at saying info. to OMB?
 - i) A: Yes. We're getting better at identifying concrete results and identifying APMs that are acceptable. Also, BOSC reviews helping.
 - ii) We fill out questionnaire, so have ability to influence our fate. But need to be smarter about it. Let's identify stories in a smart way.
 - iii) Challenge is that we're in the business of prevention – and it's hard to prove that you prevented something!
 - iv) EPA PART scores – Don't know about all that were rated as ineffective, but ecology research program was cut \$20 M. But did strike agreement on what to do to improve – identified measures and put down targets, so will need to show progress.
 - b) Q: How well is ORD's research doing relative to others? A: A few do better. We have a unique challenge in that we are a regulatory agency. NSF doesn't have to show hard core outcomes – just processing money.
 - i) Can look at Expectmore.gov - but is not set up to run those reports easily. Need to look at other regulatory agencies.

David Macarus – RSL for Region 5

- 1) The 10 RSLs are your regional connections – Hillger, O'Shea, Landy, Baugh, Macarus, Callahan, Grozinsky, Tyler, Smith, Lorenzana
- 2) How ORD can work with Regions
 - a) Hold regional workshops 2-3 time/yr - involve ORD scientists promoting their work, also outside scientists;
 - b) Participate in ORD seminars on site and remote,
 - c) RARE program – \$2M/yr – there's an ORD Project Officer for each project
 - d) Regional Methods Initiative - \$600k – for analytical methods on biological and chemical side
 - e) Regional Research Partnership Program – Regional scientists spend 3-6 months at ORD lab – very successful when it happens, but not easy to do (big personal commitment)
 - f) Product Expo's – 3 to 5 put on per year
 - g) There are ORD projects with strong regional inputs
 - h) Scientist-to-Scientist connections
 - i) ORD provides technical advice to regions on high priority issues
 - j) Regions provide input into ORD planning process thru Research Coordination Teams (RCTs) – National Program Directors (NPDs) still use those,
 - k) Agency accountability project,
 - l) Others – science forums
- 3) Examples
 - a) National workshops – hold several. Also, regional workshops (e.g., Region 5 on nutrient workshop.)

- b) RARE projects – around 150-200 since program started (20 are in Reg 5) Fate and transport of chronic wasting disease prions in landfills – Fran Kramer. DEARS – Detroit Exposure and Aerosol Research (NERL). Lots of collaboration with ORD, states and others at the start.
- c) Reg 5 – Dow leaking dioxins. Linda Birnbaum (NHEERL) helping to evaluate bioavailability.
- 4) Much of ORD work has positive impact on regions, but it's not visible to regional mgrs.
 - a) IRIS – all risk assessors use it; guidances – HH risk, eco risk, waste treatment; longer term research – genomics – will be huge in future, but mgrs don't care about it now (reinforces ivory tower concept)
- 5) What to do
 - a) get regions involved earlier so region mgrs hear more about ORD products that help regional decision makers, more visible help to mgrs, helps ORD with PART.
 - b) What's in it for ORD scientists? Regional use of ORD products helps ORD scientist on the promotion board. There's a Program office or regional rep on each board
 - c) Doing better – need earlier involvement, make regional support as important as publications in justifying promotions.
- 6) Comments
 - a) Dave has used biosketch – needed info. about road salt – Dan Pedersen used it to find 8 people.
 - b) Seems like ORD often thinks about customers at end and usually was Program Office.
 - i) important to link to regions early. ORD look to Program Office first and regions support that, but take different slant. e.g., Pesticides Program Office wants better monitoring tools. But in spring, get spray drift, so people call regions – they are on the scene, and need to make quick decisions.
 - c) Q: What's best way for scientists to identify regional needs? A: Depends on specific topics. Get direct contact between regional and ORD people doing the work. Emerges from working together – personal contact. RARE program helps make connections.
 - d) Q: Who decides topics for regional workshops? A: National Regional Science Council bubbles up topics. Also, ORD people can get together and ask for input from regions and state – will discuss and debate a topic.
 - i) Had discussion about emerging pollutants in Region 5 – bromine and flame retardants, alkyl phenols – gelled into workshop with people in ORD.
 - ii) GEOSS – regions not interested originally – so were not seeing tools. Put on Remote Sensing Workshop instead (new tech to id monitoring, which we never have enough of). OSP will fund up to 3/yr. Mike Callahan on workshop on future of risk assessment
 - e) Debda: Need system/method for collaborating. Links with prog mgrs – not getting thru proper channels – don't know who is doing what in regional scientists. Hear about them thru 3rd group. No proper pathway – collabr website. Need for afternoon session.

Trish Erikson (NRMRL Assistant Lab Director, Land). Bridging Gap Between ORD Research and Regional Applications

- 1) Opening comments
 - a) Hopes there are skeptics in audience so not preaching to choir – need skeptics to make progress
 - b) Quote on concern about potential for conflicts of time and interest when scientists are providing technical support while working on specific research projects. Don't see it as a conflict, but a natural symbiosis.
- 2) Research process

- a) Starts with planning, ends with technology transfer. Yet, often ORD stops with products – We need to provide technical support and technology transfer. It is not the client's job to find the product and figure out how to use it.
 - b) Is an evolving process. Basic and applied research, field testing and demonstrations – also implementation and tech support.
 - c) Regions are the problem owners – e.g., dealing with spray drift . They inform what we work on. They also have access to sites and partners for field testing and demos – provide real data sets.
 - d) Implementation – regions are a big measure of PART success. Don't want inventions that collect dust. Tell us what to work on next.
 - i) It's okay to keep doing what you're doing, but need to understand what works and how to modify it.
 - ii) e.g., Region 8 informed topic of vapor intrusion, asbestos.
- 3) Planning process
- a) Formal role for regions – RCTs have reps. National Regional Science Council has identified priorities and set up workgroups. There are 14 focus areas and groups
 - b) Informal – serving on topic and interest groups – very useful. Groundwater forum, Ecological Risk Assessment Forum. Regional Interest Groups (Mining Team, Dredging Team)
 - c) New concept in Land program – ad hoc research advisory Workgroups.
 - i) HSTLs involved. Go by themes – engineering, GW, etc. To get more feedback.
 - ii) Took existing research and compared it to updated needs, then handed off to regions --> changed focus of future research.
 - iii) Tech support trends help inform whether we got message across.
 - iv) RARE proposals to make projects bigger
- 4) Examples
- a) Permeable reactive barriers – regions very interested in cleaning up GW. Led to capstone report and implementation. Message goes to Region Program Manager (RPM) and then moves out.
 - b) Waste Material Characterization. Looking at effective waste mgmt – working on real materials, not spiked samples. Got materials from Reg 9.
 - i) Need waste samples to develop test method.
 - ii) What if region and program office goal is better use of waste materials and we say something else? We will need to resolve disagreements professionally as they come up.
 - c) Monitored natural attenuation of organic chemical. Regional interest – clean up an IndustriPlex site. Combined field research with tech support – regions decided on remedy, documented update, led to award.
 - d) Evapotranspiration covers – started with state contacts – for proving equivalency, mgrs need to see actual data.
 - i) We can be risk averse in regulatory environment. But going to sites in country and gathering data showing equivalence can accelerate acceptance of new technology.
 - e) In situ treatment of Lead – involves phosphate treatment to reduce bioavailability. More than 1 region and research institute involved. Big effort
 - f) Sediment dredging – we can't do it ourselves, but can link with Great Lakes region office
- 5) Products – not just journal articles and conference proceedings. Also, EPA reports – can be useful to ORD and region managers, but not other users.
- a) Suggest pulling central themes for guidance that will be used by contractors and state operators.

- b) clients think more about problem solving and implementation – no time to read through literature. Want issue papers. Want state of art on a topic – lots of requests. 8-20 page collection of info. on what we know. Very client-focused products.
- c) Bulletins and fact sheets also helpful – 2 pager. Get to people interested in that development
- d) Tech support
- 6) Examples of tech support
 - a) Stabilization of lead-contaminated soil – was site-specific project. Under stop-work order, visited site, had data review; did limited lab testing. In 2 weeks, understood problem and resolved it.
 - b) Mine drainage treatment in remote setting. Unfunded research theme making rapid progress – no formal MYP, but get lots of requests, so cobble together efforts into theme. Regions and owners brought in resources.
 - i) Results - get notes thanking us. Value is that people are willing to take a chance
 - c) Contaminated sediments technical advisory group – Program Office, regional staff, and ORD – go to toughest sites and share experiences with each other. Visit, refine and design. May be model of future vs 1-on-1 site support . More cost effective, broader sharing
 - d) Tech transfer
 - i) Can't train regions any more. Maybe put on a seminar on topical issue 3 times. Hope to capture states. Then do proceedings or DVD – more cost effective.
 - ii) Can get others to do training. Interstate Tech and Regulatory Council – does webcasting, classroom training. Exposes a lot of people
 - iii) Conf call ev 2 months for seminar series. 1.5 hr. OSWER.ORD seminar series. Can involve others to participate.
 - iv) Get your stuff on other people's sites. Use Clue-in (webinar software). Get products into sites hosted by other people
 - v) All contributes to external evaluation. SAB review, BOSC review really valued collaboration – positive external reviews count significantly in PART score.

Panel Discussion

- 1) John Meier's opening comments
 - a) Wanted to have representation across ORD. Picked folks who had significant interactions with regions. Not to showcase products, but to capture learnings. Could be mini-afternoon session and time for Q&A
 - b) Would like panel to address questions like – how to start a collaboration, whom to contact, what makes a collaboration successful, how to improve collaborations, why did you do it, how widely is product being used?
- 2) Joe Flotermersch (NERL)
 - a) Principal Investigator in Ecosystem Research Branch of EERD. Looks at indicators for surface waters – algae, benthic invertebrates. Developed collaboration with regions – short term (1-3, sometimes 5 yrs). Quick turnaround with region, state or tribe needs.
 - b) His area: develop indicators for condition of large rivers, but applies more widely. Work has evolved. Requires effective communication targeting user input from cradle to grave.
 - c) Worked with customers at beginning – what are your needs? Active listening is important. Sometimes run up against contradictions, but working thru them creates buy-in
 - d) Remember whose agenda it is – it is our project, but the region's agenda. They have to deal with it. Give stakeholder an opportunity for input and they become engaged. Seek input, active listening, getting engagement.
 - e) Pull together formal or informal workgroups.

- f) Delaware river basin project – met with Delaware Basin Commission and National Parks – beginning to look at assessment methods – sent lots of info so could identify sites. Had States, 2 regions, and park service involved – helped it stay on target and under budget.
- g) Presentations at regional and national meetings was primary way to communicate. Can pull something together quickly from discussions. Outreach to regions and other meetings
- h) Interactions with states, tribes and regions presents risk – potential disagreements . Key strategies have helped: if disagree, acknowledge their point, note it, and indicate where it may be applicable if not in this context
- i) Who uses it – a lot is presented while conducting study, then when complete, who benefits. State of KY, MS, tribes, Corp or engineers, EMAP, River Basin Commissions.
- j) 2008 Assessment of Rivers nation wide - Prospective summary – 30 yrs. Toxic releases down, air/water cleaner, better waste mgmt. New challenges – notice and comment rule-making and other tools not adequate. Need new approaches. Collaboration, consensus-bldg and facilitative leadership. Attitude is out there that this is counter to command-and-control approach.
- k) Workgroup pushing collaboration, adamant about not appearing as flimsy and not having answers. So, we need to be seen as problem-solvers. Obtain leverage thru partnership – social capital thru facilitative leadership.
- l) Q&A:
 - i) Q: What of issue of going with a product, but then get told that it's not on target. A: Reg. 3 – can't drop "product bombs" on us. We need to be invested in it.
 - ii) Debdis - How to do this – chat room? Annual workshop of regions to coordinate – can provide input annually thru presentations. Input has shaped our products.

Glenn Suter (NCEA)

- 1) Works with series of products - Stressor Identification Guidance documents, Causal Analysis/Diagnosis Decision Information System (CADDIS). Region 3 wanted to use CADDIS to identify cause of fish-kills on Potomac and Shenandoah rivers.
- 2) Lessons
 - a) Make a useful and important product.
 - i) Through workshops, identified highest priority needs for WQ. Guidance for causes of impairments was first on list.
 - ii) Using biocriteria – states had lots of impairments but no guidance on what to do next - couldn't do remediation without knowing causes.
 - iii) Developed team in way that would be useful to states, regions, Program Offices. Reached to region and Prog. Office to help (members on group).
 - b) Ensure you present products in useful form.
 - i) First was conventional report – got feedback that people couldn't follow logical process – lots of structure. Went to web-based guidance and created CADDIS website. Went broad for input on what people wanted.
 - ii) Held workshops to test stressor identification system and then CADDIS (larger workshop with 6 states to work thru process to ensure website was useful).
 - iii) How do we know whether people are using it? Asked contractor to contact all 50 states to ask if using stressor id process, so documented it.
 - iv) Can also Google it. Lots of consulting firms say they do it, universities teaching it, too. There are ways to find out if work is being used.

- v) States are often real users (regions have oversight role). So, need to go to them, but contact region for that state – keep them in loop so not going around them. Tell them what you’re doing and who you’re doing it with
 - c) Potential negative of working in regional context: work that regions come to us with is fascinating (e.g., fishkills). But can get sucked in – still have APMs.
 - i) Watch time and resources – watch out for mission creep. Have to draw the line. “We love you, but we have other things to do.”
 - d) NCEA advertising – two tech support centers in Cinc for superfund needs of regions – one for Human Health – John Reed is Director, and one for Ecol Risk Assessment – Michael Kravitz. Both are here – call extension 7740.
- 3) Q&A: Challenge is resource side and MYP process. Any advice? A: Success breeds success.
- a) Suggestion from Joe: when other states want us, say we’re willing to invest, but want states to serve as teachers to other states after presentation – we’re there for questions

Andy Avel (NHSRC)

- 1) How we identified our research agenda.
 - a) Was very stakeholder driven. After World Trade Center, ORD recognized need for research answering questions about responding to terrorist attacks.
 - b) Pulled from all ORD L/C’s (except NHEERL). Looking for what scientists recognized as data gaps – obvious needs.
 - c) Then working with stakeholders: Water folks – water works association, water treatment systems; and buildings folks - Real Estate Round Table (manage, build, and sell large facilities; and the regions.
 - d) Hard to get right group together to get message across – catch as catch can.
 - e) Focus on on-site coordinators (OSCs) – first responders. Senior manager in OSWER helped.
 - f) Talked about data gaps and research that could be done within our authority for issues specific to Homeland Security – was our research agenda.
- 2) Was beginning. Then, tried to consistently meet with stakeholders. Discuss to ensure we’re hitting right research.
 - a) Had ~15 region people detailed for 6 -12 months. 5 from ERT, several from regions and program offices.
 - b) Also took advantage of two superfund sites closing here – had surplus people: project mgrs for clean-up sites. About 20 folks did details – 8 permanently.
 - c) Good balance of hardcore researchers and responders to deliver product and know what’s needed to apply science in field to do clean up.
 - d) Daily – take opportunity to get involved with regional standing working groups and conf call.
 - i) Biweekly microbiol. teleconf.
 - ii) Regional lab directors conf call.
 - iii) Security collaborative network. All are oppties to understand what’s going on and what needs are, deliver our progress.
 - e) Developing standardized methods (Oba Vincent) to analyze chemical, biological, and environmental media (warfare agents in water). Working with NERL, and with regions to validate and write methodologies and procedures. Eventually be utilized by states
 - f) 5 Cinc. firefighters IPA’d to work with Center. IPA’d an Oregon person, too. Firefighters – look at work and ensure it’s needed and will provide answers, and products are useful.
 - g) HSTLs – Brenda of Reg 7 – pulled together states, tribes and EPA folks to discuss.
- 3) Q&A

- a) Q: What do you get from states, tribes meetings. A: HS needs that regions provide are around standardized analytical methods and know we're working as much as we can, so no wishlist per se. Some is about classified info. Not same boat.

Marc Mills (NRMRL)

- 1) How to do the work we need to do.
 - a) Comes down to picking up phone – your own initiative. Some fall into your lap. Every project evolves differently.
 - b) When you work in the field, you're in someone's region – better let them know. You will be working with utility or superfund site, so find out who in EPA is responsible.
 - c) A lot is above and beyond what we can do – national lab. Limited resources. Work with those who have capabilities we don't – analytical abilities, or access.
 - d) Require creative effort. Unsure how to structure a “system” for collaboration – there's no flowchart or mechanism. He may work with state first, then region. or utility first, or RSL – ask them what's going on and how can we bring in this project
 - i) He does a lot of superfund work and there's a link through RPM or region. Are creative ways to do things. He's successful.
 - ii) Get around travel. Secured funding from other agencies.
 - iii) Reg 5 can do some analytical work, but don't have personnel – so we funded an ORISE intern to process our samples with their expertise. Figure it out. No one magic bullet. Work hard with the people. See where priorities overlap.
- 2) Q&A, comments
 - a) Dick: Pick up phone. Regional needs may not come to you – may happen eventually the other way with success. Have 20 positions across ten regions – call any RSL or HSTL. Say who you are, what you are doing and what kind of questions you're addressing. Getting on the phone is the key. Is big shift from a few years ago when told not to call directly.
 - b) Scientists in ORD want to talk to those in Regions – lots of interest. But need approval and support of mgrs. How to get upper mgmt support in Regions. A: Managers in region 5 weren't convinced about value of work. Had to sit down face-to-face and identify their issues. We went and presented. (Joe agrees – work with scientists and share it. Get sense of opportunities).
 - c) Comment: ORD sometimes acts like regions don't have scientists, but they do. Bosses came to Debda and told him to counsel. He talked hardcore science and they wanted it. Suggest you go to regions to talk about science, not to managers. Need to create situations to talk about hardcore science, that's what we know.
 - d) Suggest having a regional panel. RSLs and HSTLs as contacts. What about scope? We do a lot of planning, and would like to run it up region's flagpole.
 - e) Q: Working with Montana small drinking water system for Superfund – about 25 people. Do RSLs and HSTLs want to know about it? What's their role? A: Nothing is too small – we never know what will blow up. Can't do everything. Prioritization procedure is critical. May be selling job for RSLs to push ORD products.
 - f) Is great time to get regions involved. Even if no one interested.
 - i) Lead Region concept: every 2 years, a region is designated as lead for program office for air, for environmental info.
 - (1) Good to go if want early cross-region perspective, but go to individual.
 - (2) Region 1 – Boston – is new lead for ORD. Rep not here today. Just started Oct 1 – Bill Lovely – will be in Narragansett next week. Always talk to each other, so just call one RSL. ORD pays for them – they are our reps.

- (3) Bobbye Smith – for SW (lead for ORMA), Dave Macarus – for MW. Reg 5 was lead for air. Tom Baugh – Reg. 4 lead for water, Maria O’Shea – Reg 2. Terry Burton – Reg 6 – Superfund and RCRA, Mike Callahan – Reg 6 (was Homeland Security last year, unsure what’s new lead).
- ii) RSL’s cover all areas in Region I. HSTL cover Superfund, RCRA, and HS. RSLs are everything else.
- g) John M – how to do interactions? A: RSLs do like hearing from folks – have researcher call up and ask for help finding program person to go to – to build communication. “Can you help me find state and program person?”
- h) Mike - We’ve had systems in place, but they can lead you astray. If you don’t like where we are in how we operate, need to build relationships. RSLs work the phones.
 - i) If want ORD and Regions working well, know there are different cultures and need people talking to each other.
 - ii) Don’t want a list of regional needs – won’t work. To regions, 5 years is not short term – 5 days or weeks is. Different culture.
 - iii) What’s been missing is more relationships, not a different system
- i) Comment: Yet, just did MYP in DW and not one region person was involved – program offices were involved, but not regions. Same for writing guidance. We don’t have these interactions – missing that link. Whose responsibility?
 - i) Regions must recognize that it’s important to do the RCT job – also, must get other regions on board – Dave did it with pesticides. Badgered other regions.
 - ii) May add to RCT with more regional reps. On paper, it is a good system

Identifying Topics for This Afternoon

- 1) Need placeholder for regional work in MYPs. Integration. Unplanned – technical support vs PART accountability
- 2) Applying generic assessments – scientists seeing applications/getting feedback from regions
- 3) Building communication bridges
- 4) Waste-containment/use of residuals – industrial waster, out-of-date RCRA rules.
- 5) Look at what ORD/Region relationships will be like 10 years from now – resources and staffing
- 6) Consultations vs actual research – how to classify? (long-term vs short-term). Accountability vs. publications.
- 7) TSCs – how to better serve clients. Why do some use ORD and others not? Need feedback from Regions.
- 8) Working with the regions – not transfer of funds. Consultation, tech support. Regions say they support your work – tell budgeters that we are relevant.
- 9) How to implement demonstrations effectively
- 10) Communication at early states of planning regional workshops with ORD-All to see whole range of ability of ORD to participate.
- 11) Technology transfer – how do you want information (products) delivered? Example of EIMS – not finding what you need? What are you looking for and how do you want it?
- 12) What will the perfect intranet page look like to foster collaborative research – regions/program offices

AFTERNOON

Summary/Synthesis from Morning Topic Brainstorming

- 1) Enhancing scientist-to-scientist interactions and ORD/Regions’ management involvement

- 2) Balancing/classifying (prioritizing) long-term (MYP) planning with technical responsiveness
- 3) Building ORD-Region relationships
- 4) ORD Product life cycle
- 5) Recognition of relevancy by decision-makers (cross-issue)

Discussion (Format – RSL panel with each RSL leading discussion on one of the issues)

Enhancing Scientist-to-Scientist interactions – Bobbye Smith

- 1) From this morning
 - a) Creating opportunities for scientist-to-scientist interactions, face-to-face. Making it cost-effective.
 - b) Bringing managers in – engage with 2-page proposals
- 2) Additional comments
 - a) Include region and ORD managers in conversations.
 - b) Face to face with managers – 2 pagers. Most mgrs are receptive. Suggest that it come from top – talk to Gray about sending out a memo that this is what we want to create.
 - c) Regional mgrs more than staff are tuned to whether there's an APM – some more flexible than others. APMs exist on both sides.
 - i) ORD research is not part of regions planning process either – they get their money and if proposal isn't on list, may not be considered. Generally, may be
 - d) Get ORD on regional directors calls to report on what's ready to use. They were surprised by permeable reactive barriers. RSLs can help get us on agendas.
 - e) When ALDs are in regional city, have RSLs set up brown bag – get them 10 at a time. More communication. Call the RSLs before you come. Also, if scientists are doing field work, let RSL know and get people to those sites to meet them.
 - i) New HSTL to Region 6 would love this interaction – finds out about people's visit after the fact. Get credit, but also DRAs and RAs want to know – no surprises
 - ii) Can use Lotus Notes to set up
 - f) Q: Do RSL's have list of who's doing what in regions? A: No. They are the database. Call them.
 - g) All scientist-to-scientist meetings in regions have been very good, but mgmt infrastructure needs work; both between regions and ORD
 - h) Q: how do you interact with Prog Offices? A: RSLs on fringe – access those when need to. Program Offices have own contacts in the regions, which are networked with offices in DC. Use rotating region lead because Prog Offices don't want to have to talk to 10 reps.
 - i) Q: What would an example of a region APM be? A: 25 TMDLs by end of week, overseeing 45 NPDES permits by ? Bean-counting.
 - j) 60% of budget goes to region states and tribes to implement delegated programs (Acts); ~40% to others; less than 1% to grants at discretion (\$200k total discretionary grant funding). 952 people.

Balancing Long-Term MYP and technical responsiveness – Maria O'Shea

- 1) From this morning
 - a) Regional involvement in MYP (integration)
 - b) Integrating technical support (placeholder)
 - c) Prioritizing efforts (need criteria?) – “classifying” regional needs
- 2) Additional comments suggestions
 - a) Hugh Tilson on MYP – best metaphor is making sausage. Responsibility went from OSP to NPDs. How they're written and whose involved varies.

- i) End product same – 5 to 10 yr plan with APGs and APMs. Differs in how programs and NPDs view the products and who's at table when plan is written.
- ii) Once written, NPDs and ORD are responsible. Is index of responsiveness and accountability. Are doing annual APM count to assess progress. Went from less planned around general topics to an accounting mechanism.
- iii) Senior mgrs are deciding funding based on how well you're doing. Very different use from intended. Promising products and are being held accountable so better be at table for discussions.
- iv) Based on experience with 2 MYPs, it's hard to get regional participation – time consuming and a lot of meetings. Get input, but not at same level as prog office.
- v) Problem areas are written in specific language – may include regions, but need advocate. Core areas – more generic level. Clients as prog off and regions – more flexible.
- vi) More discussions lately about more region involvement. All NPDs happy to see that. HH program MYP written 1 yr ago, but into maintenance and tweaking implementation and having region office perspectives now would be useful.
- vii) Would identify ORD people working in areas that regions care about – need that input, easier in core program (more flexible)
- b) Problem-driven program – much harder to change in short term. Superfund/RCRA Did MYP a year ago, but have made changes and will do a double check with them for '08 and '09 – some wiggle room to go back and insure we heard from regions. Is a living document.
 - i) HH is going back to regions and prog offices, but need reps.
- c) Q: For regions to report back to planner about having RARE project – how to help them, so can report back, esp. for PART. A: Superfund and RCRA does a product list annually – APMs and APGs in black with project products in blue.
 - i) Can write generic APG, but need regions to assist by telling us how many people use that research – is value added.
 - ii) OMB is asking what is the universe of regulatory and risk mgmt decisions that were made and how many were influenced by ORD products.
 - iii) For risk assessment, can go to IRIS and get numbers. But for regional products, don't have same database and universe. RARE database is not constructed in a manner to provide product info to a system. Can we tweak it? How to feedback the info.
 - iv) NCEA is doing it on chemicals. It's there, but needs to be formatted so easier to access.
 - v) Provide feedback to ORD as well as Program Office, so Program Office knows what we're doing as well, can then revise.
- d) ORD does 1-on-1 interaction best – very useful, but don't get credit for it on OMB. Unclear how to fix it vs research they do get credit for. How to solve it? How can we measure it?
 - i) Mike – had question a couple years ago, after got answer, he sent a thank-you note to DD – it struck a chord. So, when regions call, ask them to shoot off e-mail to boss. Can collect them.
- e) Trish – one risk of placeholders in MYP is that OCFO and OMB hits them for reductions. So, must have common understanding, but can't formalize.
- f) Does OMB value Katrina?
- g) WQ MYP – regional reps involved. Can get what we want IF there's follow-up. Needs come in very place-based, space-specific fashion.
 - i) Then realize we're national labs with national issues – must broaden out to all rivers. So needs come back broader.
 - ii) So, need to interact to show how broad aspects are applicable for more specific.

Building Relationships – Dave Macarus

- 1) From this morning
 - a) Recognizing and valuing different perspectives of ORD and regions
 - b) RSL/HSTLs as critical link
 - c) Linking to existing networks, seminars, webinars, conference calls, listservers
 - d) Set up chat room/website. Update database/biosketch
 - e) Look out to 10 years – what does relationship look like?
 - f) What's the perfect intranet site?
- 2) Additional comments
 - a) Sustainability is big issue in regions. Consider longer than 1 year to be sustainability!
 - b) Central RSL website is under OSP website – get name and address list of RSLs – Dick will send to participants
 - c) Mike – relationships cost effort and time. Why are we here?
 - i) On one end is we do nothing and leave it; doing PART damage control but not more;
 - ii) On other end is ideal – people in ORD understand what's going on in Regions and region culture and what's needed, and vice versa, and know what regions can ask of us.
 - iii) In middle is idea of salesman
 - (1) ORD is counterpart to commercial company with products – websites and databases.
 - (2) ORD puts out a press release – but it only attracts those waiting for it. Not until there's a sales force will you get rest to use it.
 - (3) Need salesman that understands your life and can connect products to meeting needs – this could be really good for you. Currently, is nobody's job. Not RSL's job – is a full-time job, but could really bring benefits. Can you afford to not do that? Where do we want to be on this continuum?
 - (4) PIs looked to ACD and ALD to do it, but they aren't. Need a discussion site. Is this something we can collaborate on?
 - (5) Bobbye – you have a sales force, but it's not directed to regions. Communications group (Michael Brown) targets info. to the public – is beginnings of it.
 - (a) How do we access and use it effectively? Are building websites and structures.
 - (b) Still missing technical salesperson. Is a company of 18k employees with sales force of 20! Long way to go!
 - (c) Michael Brown's group are translators, but may not be selling to the target.
 - iv) Salesman analogy – look at Dell – their salespeople bring the problems back to engineers. Is key link to identifying the next problems.
 - (1) Region cultures – not so many techie people – won't work on websites.
 - v) Is relationships as well as sales – regions are colleagues. Good to build communication and relationships.
 - (1) Putting joint names on papers makes mgrs happy. Build on what's working.
 - (2) Buy regions stuff if they are willing to help – a little gadget gets a lot of goodwill with region mgmt. Be creative – no one way to do it.
 - (3) Be sure to close loop on collaborations.

ORD Product Life Cycle – Mike Callahan

- 1) From this morning
 - a) Concept: includes design, “construction,” implementation (tech support, tech-transfer and TSC), feedback.
 - b) Getting feedback on utility and applications

- c) How to better serve clients
 - d) How to deliver useful products.
 - e) Getting feedback for continuous improvement
 - f) Optimizing Tech Support Centers
- 2) Additional comments:
- a) Often a long time before get any feedback on product utility. Sometimes don't get any – in some cases, region contact is gone!
 - i) One RA wrote a memo to PI's boss – was great for career and satisfaction.
 - ii) We publish papers and if have good collaboration with regional scientists, can rotate papers through them to benefit everyone.
 - iii) How did our product contribute to the outcome? May involve assumptions – e.g., best estimates on who is using a DW treatment method. Can go around to regions about who has the assessment programs in place and make some assumptions.
 - iv) How do we get those success stories on a broad scale? ORD's success is regions' success (Regions don't get PARTed directly, but indirectly). Think of process to bring outcome-oriented products to table.
 - v) Ask upfront – Please tell me what happens at the end. Make it part of the bargain.
 - b) A lot of decisions at regions get made at staff level. By the time a decision gets up to senior mgrs, lots of little ones have been made. Would be great if could funnel to one place, but is a distributed process.
 - c) The more we can help the scientist-to-scientist meetings and can track, the better for building relationships. Don't fall victim to bean counters – relationship is what matters.
 - d) Also, have National Regional Council – talk about common issues. Started from 150 – went to 14! (Dick will post top 14 NRC and white papers on OSP site).
 - i) Q: Was ORD the intended recipient of those 14 needs or was there a plan? Never delivered to NPDs. A: Each of those 14 had a champion - Tom for innovative treatment technologies – he formed a workgroup or regional folks, and just sent to Randy Wentzel. Decentralized how each champion will deliver. These were needs for anyone – not just ORD. Initially looked for low-hanging fruit. Wanted to make it clearer to NPDs as to what regions need.
 - e) Product life-cycle – would like to have sales staff to help. But if we, as scientists, are all independent and take products all the way through by ourselves (do our own desktop publishing) and my responsibility to get it to clients hands and follow-up!! Is our reality.
 - f) Implementation phase – e.g., safe DW to rural communities. University bales when funding dries up. How can we, in implementation phase, spread word to other areas when money is gone.
 - i) In EERD, brought scientists here and also put on website – get word out. Take site-specific product and make it available to all regions – take it from journal to something everyone can use.
 - ii) On eco side, have annual regional biologist meetings – can take products to those.
 - g) Patents have been a nightmare – we're not lawyers, so have to go to them. Can't commercialize unless getting patents, and scientists get stuck in it. Gov't contractor attorneys get involved, but are low bidders. Can impact
 - i) Sarah Bauer – Federal Technology Transfer Act support. Function moved to DC in OSP for entire agency. Interface. There are opportunities – great science in EPA.
 - ii) Best way to get patents into marketplace is by working with private industry who will license.
- (1) CRADA – can exchange resources (can't give money).

- (2) Material Transfer Agreements
- (3) User facility agreements.
- (4) Licensing. They will work with you – call them. Can party up with academia, private industry to move science.

Recognizing/Communicating Relevance to Decision-makers – Tom Baugh

- 1) From this morning
 - a) Getting political support for these efforts – in context of PART, to get \$
- 2) Comments
 - a) Outreach to regions – great support from our administration, but resources/time gets taken away from our other duties. How do we get people controlling our fate and money to say yes, its important?
 - b) Love RARE – big benefits: builds our expertise, but little money comes with it. Multiple collaborators, but can't use money for travel – we have to use ours. How to take a small amount of grants for travel.
 - c) Q: What do people in ORD think of RARE. A: great to have a project selected, but then \$ goes to grant. But, project involves field work, yet no travel!!
 - i) Advantage that they can go thru noncompetitive basis – but waiver is expiring
 - ii) Some labs want to play with RARE, others don't.
 - iii) Memo to Gray – ask help?? But announcement comes from AA office – can't play that card all the time. Better to look for reason of something to fix.
 - iv) Costs same in time to put a \$300k project vs a \$30k, so these little ones are less attractive – harder to get something done. Becomes cubicle to cubicle. Great collaboration experience
 - d) EERD had several successful projects. Have on-site tech support contract, which helps a lot – vehicle for getting samples analyzed and for field work. Also, use it to complement existing work – not something new. Fits portfolio. Headache to get money in, but plus in planning process, so always respond. Can show it is needed.
 - i) RARE paperwork isn't so bad – competition part is.
 - ii) MBTE project – wanted \$75k of RARE money, but willing to put in \$75K of own. So while \$30k may not be much, can look for other sources and it is more likely to be funded.
 - iii) Some experiences of funding from state – now, dealing with dry deposition of Hg in atmosphere – state of FL put in \$100k. Region 4 put in \$100k from '05 and from '06. Can get other regions in it, too.
 - iv) Sometimes regions putting money in shames Program Office for not putting in!
 - v) Sometimes seed funding in one year attracts additional funding in subsequent years.
 - e) Regional Methods Initiative – EERD is small division with small budget, so can be competitive. Has been even a greater success story. Headwaters streams work – most comes from RM money. Document coming. Study involved 1500 macrovertebrate samples
 - i) Every region has \$200k for projects for RARE. For RM, heads of respective offices in regions collectively decide which to fund – different process. Is extramural money.
 - f) Decision-makers – who are they and who decides relevancy? One application went into process, was well regarded, but killed on relevancy!! Unknown who killed it.
 - g) For regions, senior mgmt looks out differently from staff – want to respond to admin in DC, AAs and state gov't, also fires they're fighting. Staff level is more on tech problems and day to day needs. Is big opportunity for staff.

- i) Relevancy – bean counting. Would help to track how products use. Addressing technical issues is incredibly relevant professionally, although won't necessarily make PART. For other work, need to track.
- ii) Region 5 has 6 priorities on website. Doesn't require creative thinking to make project fit it. Not real limitation – very broad.
- h) When we do planning, when we write final APM product, need to add product that is the tech transfer piece.

Next Steps

- 1) To send to attendees:
 - a) Notes transcription and summary (Ken will provide to Dick)
 - b) Electronic evaluation form (Dick)
 - c) Solicitation of members to existing ORD-Region collaboration workgroup (Dick)
 - d) Electronic file of RSL names and addresses
- 2) Post RTP and Cinc workshop summaries and presentations on OSP website (Dick)
- 3) What ORD PIs can do
 - a) Send RSL's monthly updates from T&E to send to their drinking water folks
 - b) Will send gist of projects on children's health to forward to interested persons
 - c) Can send product to RSL after get L/C/O clearance, so RSL can tell us what to do with it and forward it to right people
- 4) What RSLs can do
 - a) Send notice about annual regional meeting to ORD-All
 - b) Send calendar of meetings and forums (seminars, webinars, conf. calls, listservers) to Dick for posting on OSP website.